FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700254

A. List of Restoration Activities

The Inyo National Forest is proposing to restore areas where proliferation and expansion of dispersed sites (OHV dispersed camping areas and staging areas) and incursions into closed areas are resulting in impacts to sensitive resources. Restoration activities would include installing barriers, breaking up compacted soils, recontouring, vertical mulching with native materials, and planting native vegetation to restore these areas to natural conditions. This project is intended to reduce impacts to soils, vegetation, and water quality, as well as protect other resource values such as sensitive plants and heritage resources. Restoration work would be completed with a small trail dozer (which would be purchased as part of this project funding), and by hand using conventional hand tools. The restoration areas would be posted with signage, and would be patrolled and monitored for effectiveness.

It is anticipated that the work would focus on three main areas; previously closed and restored sites (which have been reopened by users), popular OHV staging and dispersed camping areas, and newly created user routes. In areas previously closed and restored, the additional restoration efforts would focus on the installation of barriers which will prohibit users to access the area. Special attention will be paid to the use of local and/or native materials whenever possible, but the purpose of these re-entries is to eliminate use in these areas to continue the restoration process. It is anticipated that in some cases, barriers will need to be more substantial to meet this goal, and additional restoration activities as described above would need to be completed.

In the OHV staging and dispersed camping areas, efforts will focus on the protection of critical watershed values through measures to restrict users from parking/driving/camping within and immediately adjacent to riparian areas. As these popular areas have expanded over the last several years, accelerating damage to ground resources have increased the potential for serious water quality issues. The restoration would be accomplished by breaking up compacted soil, vertical mulching, planting native vegetation, spreading slash/mulch, and placing physical barriers to keep vehicles out of the restoration areas and to delineate the campsites and use areas. Again, use of local native material and "green" building products (with recycled content) would be an element of this project. It is anticipated that through careful restoration design, users will be treated to quality camping/staging opportunities that will better protect resource values while also enhancing visitor experience.

Lastly, restoration efforts will be undertaken along popular travelways where newly created user routes are causing resource damage. This project will focus on areas where decisions have already been completed and would be consistent with the ongoing Travel Management Planning effort on the Forest (i.e. not on/along routes being analyzed for designation). Much of the work associated with this element involves simple activities such as using native materials to disguise freshly created user routes. Some installation of signs is expected where these activities would be insufficient. Where needed, heavier restoration activities, including barrier placement would be utilized.

Planning would be completed prior to any on the ground implementation efforts, and would include full project designs and environmental analysis. This includes conducting site visits and field surveys to develop the proposed action, engaging the public in the proposed restoration efforts, completion of specialist reports, and ultimately completing the NEPA analysis and documentation. Project planning would be expected to be completed in 2010/2011 and implementation would begin during the summer/fall months of 2011 and 2012. Monitoring would occur for several years following implementation.

The purchase of a Sweco trail tractor is included in this project request. While it is anticipated that this equipment may be used in other facets of the OHV program on the Forest, its primary purpose would be in support of this and other OHV restoration projects. This will be the only equipment of this kind on the Forest, and would also be available to the Bishop Field Office of the BLM.

B. How the Proposed Project Relates to OHV Recreation

This project involves restoration activities, which are an integral part of a safe and responsible, well-managed OHV program that focuses on providing a quality OHV recreation experience while minimizing impacts to natural resources. This project will ensure the long-term sustainability of motorized vehicle recreation by restoring areas that have been impacted by such use. The project area encompasses some of the highest used OHV locations across the Forest and

areas that are highly visible. The expansion of campsites into riparian areas, illegal incursions into closed areas, loss of vegetation, and impacts to water quality and other sensitive resources could adversly affect OHV opportunities. For example, restoration activities focussed in dispersed camping and staging areas such as Glass Creek, Deadman Creek, and Coyote occur in areas which have become very popular for OHV activities and have seen increases in use and impact over the last several years. This increase in use has resulted in the expansion of these OHV dispersed sites and the need for restoration activities designed to reduce impacts to riparian areas and water quality. In areas where restoration activities focus on reinforcing previously closed and restored areas, such as Reed Flat (a route closed to OHV use over 30 years ago), this project is needed to keep motorized vehicles off the previously closed areas to allow the restoration process to continue. With recent OHV activity, which has accelerated resource impacts and slowed the restoration process, additional efforts are needed to restore long-term success of this project.

C. Size of Project Site

There are several key project area locations:

Reed Flat – Approximately 1.5 miles of previously closed route would be reinforced with barriers and the old route would be restored. T6S, R34 and 35E; T7S, R34 and35E, multiple sections (Blanco Mountain Quad, Westgard Pass Quad)

Deadman Creek – Restore areas where dispersed campsites have expanded into riparian areas along the 2 mile stretch of Deadman Creek Road. T3S, R26E multiple sections (Mammoth Mountain Quad)

Glass Creek – Restore areas where dispersed campsites have expanded into riparian areas along approximately 7 miles of Glass Creek Road. T2S, R27E, multiple sections (Old Mammoth Quad)

Coyote – Restore areas where dispersed campsites have expanded into riparian areas along approximately 6 miles of road near Coyote Lake, Funnel Lake, and Baker Creek. T8S, R32E,multiple sections (Coyote Flat Quad)

Mono Basin – Restore previously closed and restored areas on approximately 7 miles of road. T1N, R27, 28E & T1S, R28E multiple sections (Mono Mills Quad)

Parker Bench - Restore approximately 2 acres. T1S, R26E, sec 17 (Koip Peak Quad)

D. Monitoring and Methodology

Monitoring would be conducted by OHV personnel on a routine basis and Forest resource specialists annually to determine the projects' effectiveness, and need for additional treatments. The project will be successful if it meets the following criteria:

• No evidence of new (illegal) OHV use in closed/restored areas

• Restored areas show signs of improved soil conditions and vegetative recovery

• Campsite condition does not show sign of expansion

Monitoring would included the following methodologies:

Personnel would document observations (i.e. evidence of motorized vehicle incursions, such as tire tracks, reports from the public, or actual observations). If OHV use is still occuring or restoration areas are not showing signs of improvement, additional restoration work would be completed incorporating appropriate strategies to eliminate illegal OHV use and continue to improve resource conditions. These adaptive management strategies will ensure long-term success in these areas.

Photo point monitoring and observations would occur to determine if soil and vegetation conditions have improved. Photo points would be established prior to the implementation of project activities. Pre- and post project photos and observations would document the bare soil and vegetation conditions (i.e. percent ground cover, etc.). These photo points and observations would determine if vegetation cover is increasing as a result of project activities. The areas would be

routinely patrolled, however formal site visits would occur at least once per summer for the first two years following implementation. The initial monitoring effort (first two growing seasons) is expected to provide some indication of vegetation recovery to determine the success of the restoration project. Depending on the success of the project, the restoration sites would be monitored at longer intervals during the next 10 years.

E. List of Reports

Planning would need to be conducted prior to implementation of the proposed project. The following documents would be produced from this planning effort, and would be part of the project file:

Decision Memo (NEPA documentation) - Would include the purpose and need, proposed action, and the environmental analysis. Supporting documentation includes, Biological Assessment/Evaluation for plants; Noxious Weed Risk Assessment; Biological Assessment/Evaluation for wildlife, and Heritage Resource Report.

Monitoring Report - Includes photo points and documented observations that would be produced and updated to include project planning (pre-project monitoring), implementation, and post project monitoring information. The monitoring report would also serve as an accomplishment report, and would describe the work that was completed.

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

N/A - This restoration project does not involve scientific and cultural studies.

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

The restoration areas would be a focus area for patrol by OHV patrols (Forest Protection Officers) and Forest Law Enforcement Officers, as part of the ongoing monitoring, education, and enforcement efforts. In the last year, the Forest compliment of Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) has risen from one officer to five LEOs, greatly increasing the field presence and enforcement needed to educate the public and protect these types of restored areas. The restoration areas are located in highly visible areas and would be patrolled regularly throughout the high use periods (May-October).

As part of the restoration activities, barriers would be installed to keep motorized vehicles out of closed and restored areas. Signage would be installed and regularly maintained to insure protection of the restored area. Monitoring, as described above would also insure project success.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700254

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

Coyote and Reed Flat Project Location
Deadman Creek and Glass Creek Project Location
Parker Bench Project Location
Mono Basin Project Location

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

Coyote and Reed Flat Restoration Project Areas
Mono Basin Restoration Project Area
Deadman, Glass Creek, Parker Bench Restoration Project Areas

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # _____		
APPLICANT NAME :	USFS - Inyo National Forest		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration - Forest Projects	**PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :**	
PROJECT TYPE :	☐ Acquisition ☐ Development ☐ Education & Safety ☐ Ground Operations ☐ Law Enforcement ☐ Planning ☑ Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	The Inyo National Forest is proposing to restore areas where proliferation and expansion of dispersed sites (OHV dispersed camping areas and staging areas) and incursions into closed areas are resulting in impacts to sensitive resources. Restoration activities would include installing barriers, breaking up compacted soils, recontouring, vertical mulching with native materials, and planting native vegetation to restore these areas to natural conditions. This project is intended to reduce impacts to soils, vegetation, and water quality, as well as protect other resource values such as sensitive plants and heritage resources. Restoration work would be completed with a small trail dozer (which would be purchased as part of this project funding), and by hand using conventional hand tools. The restoration areas would be posted with signage, and would be patrolled and monitored for effectiveness. It is anticipated that the work would focus on three main areas; previously closed and restored sites (which have been reopened by users), popular OHV staging and dispersed camping areas, and newly created user routes. In areas previously closed and restored, the additional restoration efforts would focus on the installation of barriers which will prohibit users to access the area. Special attention will be paid to the use of local and/or native materials whenever possible, but the purpose of these re-entries is to eliminate use in these areas to continue the restoration process. It is anticipated that in some cases, barriers will need to be more substantial to meet this goal, and additional restoration activities as described above would need to be completed. In the OHV staging and dispersed camping areas, efforts will focus on the protection of critical watershed values through measures to restrict users from parking/driving/camping within and immediately adjacent to riparian areas. As these popular areas have expanded over the last several years, accelerating damage to ground resources have increased the potential for serious water quality issues. The restoration would be accomplished by breaking up compacted soil, vertical mulching, planting native vegetation, spreading slash/mulch, and placing physical barriers to keep vehicles out of the restoration areas and to delineate the campsites and use areas. Again, use of local native material and "green" building products (with recycled content) would be an element of this project. It is anticipated that through careful restoration design, users will be treated to quality camping/staging opportunities that will better protect resource values while also enhancing visitor experience. Lastly, restoration efforts will be undertaken along popular travelways where newly created user routes are causing resource damage. This project will focus on areas where decisions have already been completed and would be consistent with the ongoing Travel Management Planning effort on the Forest (i.e. not on/along routes being analyzed for designation). Much of the work associated with this element involves simple activities such as using native materials to disguise freshly created user routes. Some installation of signs is expected where these activities would be insufficient. Where needed, heavier restoration activities, including barrier placement would be utilized. Planning would be completed prior to any on the ground implementation efforts, and would include full project designs and environmental analysis. This includes conducting site visits and field surveys to develop the proposed action, engaging the public in the proposed restoration efforts, completion of specialist reports, and ultimately completing the NEPA analysis and documentation. Project planning would be expected to be completed in 2010/2011 and implementation would begin during the summer/fall months of 2011 and 2012. Monitoring would occur for several years following implementation. The purchase of a Sweco trail tractor is included in this project request. While it is anticipated that this equipment may be used in other facets of the OHV program on the Forest, its primary purpose would be in support of this and other OHV restoration projects. This will be the only equipment of this kind on the Forest, and would also be available to the Bishop Field Office of the BLM.		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	**Staff**						
	Archeologist Notes : Field surveys, Heritage Resource Report, and monitoring.	35.000	300.000	DAY	10,500.00	0.00	10,500.00
	Botanist Notes : Field Surveys, Biological Evaluations, and Noxious Weed Risk Assessments.	25.000	320.000	DAY	8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00
	Other-Wildlife Biologist Notes : Field Surveys, Biological Evaluations.	15.000	320.000	DAY	4,800.00	0.00	4,800.00
	Other-Hydrologist Notes : Field visits, recommendations for implementation, watershed report, and monitoring.	40.000	350.000	DAY	14,000.00	0.00	14,000.00
	Other-Project Leader/Coordinator Notes : Lead project planning efforts, including developing proposed action, public involvement contact, and completed the environmental analysis. Coordinate implementation and monitoring.	50.000	300.000	DAY	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00
	Other-Restoration Crew Notes : 4 person crew for 60 days to complete handwork.	240.000	150.000	DAY	36,000.00	0.00	36,000.00
	Other-Equipment Operator Notes : Implementation of restoration activities. Includes transport, operation, and equipment maintenance that is related to the restoration project.	80.000	350.000	DAY	28,000.00	0.00	28,000.00
	Other-Volunteers Notes : Individual and sponsored volunteers. Student groups, ski patrols, adopt a trail, OHV user groups, Friends of the Inyo, individuals.	120.000	130.000	DAY	0.00	15,600.00	15,600.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-OHV Patrols Notes : Patrol, Monitoring, and Maintenance of restoration sites (i.e. signage, barriers, public education, enforcement).	80.000	175.000		14,000.00	0.00	14,000.00
	Other-Forest Recreation Officer Notes : Directly involved with project treatments, as well as supporting the NEPA analysis.	10.000	390.000	MOS	0.00	3,900.00	3,900.00
	Other-Forest Resource Officer Notes : Directly involved with project treatments, as well as supporting the NEPA analysis.	15.000	400.000	MOS	0.00	6,000.00	6,000.00
	Other-Forest Planner	5.000	350.000	MOS	0.00	1,750.00	1,750.00
	Total for Staff				130,300.00	27,250.00	157,550.00
2	**Contracts**						
	Other-Dump Charges Notes : Dump fees for solid waste associated with restoration project.	1.000	500.000	EA	0.00	500.00	500.00
3	**Materials / Supplies**						
	Trash Bags	40.000	25.000	EA	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
	Other-Carsonite Signs Notes : Carsonite signs and stickers.	300.000	25.000	EA	7,500.00	0.00	7,500.00
	Other-Map Notes : OSV & OHV information board display maps and handouts.	30.000	100.000	EA	3,000.00	0.00	3,000.00
	Other-Tools Notes : Post hole diggers, carsonite sign installer, shovels, pulaskis, rock bars, wheel barrows, rakes, fence posts, water containers, etc.	1.000	2000.000	MISC	1,500.00	500.00	2,000.00
	Other-Personal Protective Equipment Notes : Gloves, goggles, sunscreen, hardhats, chaps, knee pads	1.000	3500.000	MISC	2,500.00	1,000.00	3,500.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	and shoulder shoulder protective gear, back braces, back packs, first aid kits, etc.						
	Total for Materials / Supplies				14,500.00	2,500.00	17,000.00
4	**Equipment Use Expenses**						
	Other-OHV Equipment Maintenance Notes : Routine OHV maintenance, new tires, tire plug kits, lube and oil needs, general maintenance.	1.000	1500.000	MISC	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00
	Other-Vehicle Mileage Forest Notes : Estimated mileage for planning, implementation, and monitoring for 4x4 pickup truck for Forest wide project. Restoration Crew - 8,000 miles OHV Patrols - 6,000 miles Project Leader/Coordinator - 6,000 miles Resource Specialist Mileage - 4,000 miles Equipment Operator - 6,000 miles Total: 30000 miles	30000.000	0.560	MI	0.00	16,800.00	16,800.00
	Other-Vehicle FOR Notes : Monthly cost for vehicles in support of planning, implementation, and monitoring Forest wide. OHV Patrols - 12 months Restoration Crew - 24 months Project Leader/Coordinator - 9 months Resource Specialist Vehicles - 6 months Equipment Operator - 12 months Total = 63 months over 3 year period.	63.000	360.000	MOS	0.00	22,680.00	22,680.00
	Other-OHV Equipment FOR Notes : FOR for forest owned OHV equipment in support of these restoration activities, including 1 side-side (UTV) and 1 ATV. Total of six months.	6.000	200.000	MOS	0.00	1,200.00	1,200.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				1,500.00	40,680.00	42,180.00
5	**Equipment Purchases**						
	Other-Tractor/Bobcat Notes : SWECO or Kubota type tractor for performing restoration projects.	1.000	45000.000	EA	45,000.00	0.00	45,000.00
	Other-Tractor Trailer Notes : Trailer for transporting Tractor.	1.000	12000.000	EA	12,000.00	0.00	12,000.00
	Other-OHV Trailer Notes : Purchase trailer for side-by-side (South Zone).	1.000	2500.000	EA	2,500.00	0.00	2,500.00
	Total for Equipment Purchases				59,500.00	0.00	59,500.00
6	**Others**						
7	**Administrative Costs**						
	Administrative Costs-OHV Restoration Pro Notes : OHV Restoration Program and Grant Administration, including program oversight, supervision, budgeting, tracking budget/expenditures, billing, record keeping, etc.).	1.000	29000.000	MISC	0.00	29,000.00	29,000.00
Total Program Expenses					205,800.00	99,930.00	305,730.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					205,800.00	99,930.00	305,730.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					**205,800.00**	**99,930.00**	**305,730.00**

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	130,300.00	27,250.00	157,550.00	
2	Contracts	0.00	500.00	500.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	14,500.00	2,500.00	17,000.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	1,500.00	40,680.00	42,180.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	59,500.00	0.00	59,500.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Administrative Costs	0.00	29,000.00	29,000.00	
Total Program Expenses		205,800.00	99,930.00	305,730.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		205,800.00	99,930.00	305,730.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		**205,800.00**	**99,930.00**	**305,730.00**	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700254

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

ITEM 2

b. ITEM 2 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? (Please select Yes or No) ◉ Yes ○ No

c. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ○ No

d. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 3 – 9

ITEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

The restoration projects are being proposed to restore areas where proliferation and expansion of dispersed sites and incursions into closed areas are resulting in impacts to sensitive resources (i.e. water quality, soils, and vegetation). The restoration projects are expected to reduce impacts and improve watershed conditions, and habitat for sensitive species.

Restoration activities would occur in the vicinity of Coyote Creek, Baker Creek, Coyote Lake, Funnel Lake, Deadman Creek, Glass Creek, and Parker Creek, and are being proposed to reduce the effects to water quality and riparian areas from OHV recreation activities (i.e. parking, driving, and camping in the vicinity of riparian areas). Project activities include breaking up compacted soils, vertical mulching, and placing physical barriers to keep vehicles out of the restoration areas. These activities are designed to reduce sedimentation and erosion, and would result in improvements to water quality and protection of riparian areas, which provide quality habitat for a variety of species.

The restoration areas do provide potential habitat for a variety of plant and animal species. There are no federally listed proposed, threatened, or endangered species that potentially occur within the restoration areas, however there is potential habitat for several Forest Service sensitive species, including northern goshawk, American marten, greater sage grouse, Mono milkvetch, and Mono Lake lupine. The restoration activities would improve habitat for these species by reducing route proliferation and incursions into closed areas, reducing impacts to riparian areas, and enhancing vegetation and watershed conditions.

Site specific planning would occur prior to implementation of the restoration activities, and would include environmental analysis. Measures to minimize or eliminate potential effects to watershed, plant, and wildlife resources would be incorporated into the project design. Monitoring for similar restoration and conservation projects that have been completed during the last 10 years on the Inyo National Forest have indicated beneficial effects to watershed, plant, and wildlife resources. No adverse effects from implementation of these types of projects have been documented. Restoration activities as proposed under this project would not have adverse effects to wetlands, navigable waters, and sensitive habitats and species, and should benefit these resources. The purpose of the restoration activities are to minimize effects and improve watershed and habitat conditions.

ITEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

The cumulative impacts from this project should be beneficial. Over the past 10 years, various restoration and conservation efforts have occurred across the Inyo National Forest and in the vicinity of the restoration project areas proposed under this project. Monitoring for similar restoration and conservation projects that have been completed during the last 10 years on the Inyo National Forest have indicated beneficial effects to watershed, plant, and wildlife resources. No adverse effects from implementation of these types of projects have been documented. This project is expected to contribute towards the implementation of a well managed OHV recreation opportunity by restoring areas that have been impacted by OHV use, thereby contributing towards a more sustainable OHV recreation program.

This project, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions of the same type and general place would not result in adverse cumulative effects. In general, these projects are small in scope and scale, and have not resulted in a significant displacement of OHV use to other areas. A significant increase in OHV use in other areas has not been documented from other similar projects, and therefore an increase in noise or traffic or other adverse cumulative impacts is not expected from implementation of this restoration project.

ITEM 5 - Soil Impacts

The purpose of this restoration project is to reduce the area of bare, compacted soil, and allow for increased vegetative cover that will increase soil stability. Therefore, there will be a positive effect on soil productivity and a reduction in soil erosion. Although soils in the project area are highly erosive pumice soils, this project is expected to reduce soil erosion. The restoration projects would not occur on steep slopes.

ITEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources

The Deadman and Glass Creek Restoration project areas are located in the vicinity of Highway 395, which is a designated state scenic highway. In addition, the Mono Basin Restoration project occurs within the Mono Basin National Scenic Area. Most of the restoration work would not occur within the viewshed of Highway 395. These restoration projects however, are expected to improve visual quality by restoring vegetation and naturalizing areas that have bare ground, compacted soils, and loss of vegetation. The projects would be completed using native materials, and in general are expected to result in improvements to scenic resources. There would be no adverse effects to scenic resources from implementation of this project.

ITEM 7 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts.

ITEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts

The efforts proposed under this restoration project would focus on previously closed areas and restored sites (which have been reopened by users), popular OHV staging areas and dispersed camping areas, and newly created user routes. In general, these projects are small in scope and scale, and are not anticipated to result in a significant displacement of OHV use to other areas. There should be minimal change in use in previously closed areas and restored sites and within the dispersed camping areas. For the most part, the previously closed areas and newly created user routes are seeing incidental use. In relation to the OHV staging areas and dispersed camping areas, the restoration work would maintain dispersed campsites that would meet the capacity for these areas. Most of the restoration work within the dispersed campsites and staging areas would be to reduce the size of the sites and pull the areas back from stream courses and riparian areas.

Past experience from implementation of similar restoration projects in other areas on the Inyo National Forest and in the vicinity of these proposed restoration areas have not resulted in a significant displacement of OHV use to other areas. This project is small in scope and scale, and is not expected to result in displacement of OHV use to other areas or result in adverse indirect effects.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700254

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 76% or more (10 points)
- ○ 51% - 75% (5 points)
- ◉ 26% - 50% (3 points)
- ○ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 12

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☑ Domestic water supply (4 points)
- ☑ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
- ☑ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
- ☑ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
- ☑ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [3 (John Muir Wilderness, riparian areas, and pumice flats)]
- ☑ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species [Owens tui chub, Lahontan cutthroat trout]
- ☐ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

The restoration activities are designed to reduce impacts to riparian areas, water quality, and other sensitive resources, such as sensitive plants and heritage resources. The restoration project areas occur within watersheds that drain into the Owens Valley, which is a municipal water supply for Southern California. Many of the popular dispersed camping areas that would be restored occur in the vicinity of streams and riparian areas. The lack of vegetative cover and bare ground is leading to increased erosion and sedimentation into streams, impacting water quality and aquatic species habitat. The project is designed to restore these areas by breaking up compacted soil, providing ground cover, and promoting revegetation of these sites. The Forest has known heritage resource sites and sensitive plant locations in the vicinity of OHV areas, and without proactive restoration these sensitive resources are at risk.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
- ◉ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
- ○ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
- ○ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
- ○ Management decision (1 point)
- ○ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
- ○ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

Observations on the ground indicate that the current condition is inconsistent with the Inyo National Forest LRMP, as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (2004).

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 12

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- [x] Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- [x] Use of native plants and materials
- [x] Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- [x] Educational signage
- [x] Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

As described in the project description, project activities specifically include installation of barriers to control motor vehicle incursions, revegetation with native plants, signage, and monitoring efforts. The project will be successful by: monitoring and adjusting restoration strategies based on the results of monitoring; installation and maintenance of barriers, which will delineate appropriate camping sites, travel routes, and restoration areas; using native vegetation to restore areas to natural conditions; and signing, which will help the public understand and allow us to continue to provide OHV opportunites. Best management practices would be incorporated into the project design and implemented.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ No (No points)
- ◉ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

Inyo National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1988) and Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (2004)

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ◉ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ○ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ○ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)

- [ ] Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- [x] Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The topic has been discussed over multiple stakeholder meetings, including the OHV leadership forum. This project was a subject discussed during two different public field visits aimed at examining OHV opportunities and Travel Management planning on the Inyo National Forest during the fall of 2008.

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 2

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 4 or more (4 points)
- ◉ 2 to 3 (2 points)
- ○ 1 (1 point)
- ○ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Friends of the Inyo and local access groups.

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will 4

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
- [ ] Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
- [x] Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
- [x] Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

Planning efforts, including field surveys and experience with similar restoration projects will determine the appropriate restoration techniques and lead to implementation. In addition, monitoring efforts would also be documented and would focus on the "lessons learned", and the overall success of the restoration project.

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ No (No points)
- ◉ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

Site delineation and new restoration techniques improve our ability to address underlying issues, such as increase in vehicle numbers and change in vehicle type that has led to the degradation associated with this project. Improved signing will also demonstrate clearly to the OHV users the intent of the project and the need for their continued support in the improvement of resources in the project area.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ◉ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)

- 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)